



Louisville Metro Government



Metro Corrections: Vision 20/20

Report of Recommendations



August 2008





LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY
LOUISVILLE METRO
CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMISSION

JERRY E. ABRAMSON
MAYOR

JUDGE JUDITH K. BARTHOLOMEW
CHAIR

KIM M. ALLEN
DIRECTOR

August 1, 2008

Honorable Jerry E. Abramson, Mayor
4th Floor, Louisville Metro Hall
527 West Jefferson Street
Louisville, Kentucky 40202

Dear Mayor Abramson:

On behalf of the membership of the Metro Corrections: Vision 20/20 Commission, we are pleased to submit this final report, which details the work of the Commission over a six-month period. In response to the charge you gave to the group on November 29, 2007, Commission members met on a total of ten occasions to become better informed about the significant challenges facing the Louisville Metro Department of Corrections, to learn about progressive approaches used in other jurisdictions, and to identify a range of possible options to more efficiently manage the jail population.

The 37 recommendations contained within this report reflect a multifaceted and comprehensive approach that includes measures to streamline case processing and enhance the use of alternative programs as well as to expand the existing jail capacity. The Commission recognizes that it is not possible to "out-build" a crowding problem and that new jail construction is not always the sole or most appropriate response, however, population trends reviewed by the Commission substantiate the need to begin planning for future construction.

We would like to express our sincere appreciation to the members of the Commission and the Resource Team for the time and energy they committed to this important project. We would also like to thank the individuals who made presentations before the group or provided valuable data and background information for our consideration. Lastly, we believe that the participation of both system and community representatives allowed the Commission to take a fresh look at longstanding issues; it facilitated creative thinking and challenged us to move beyond the status quo. We urge you to retain this model as you move forward with the implementation phase.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "Martin E. Johnstone". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Martin" being more prominent than the last name "Johnstone".

Justice Martin E. Johnstone
Co-Chair

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "Edmund P. Karem". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Edmund" being more prominent than the last name "Karem".

Judge Edmund P. Karem
Co-Chair

Metro Corrections: Vision 20/20

Table of Contents

Vision 20/20 Membership List	2
Mayor’s Charge to The Commission	3
Commission Goals/Objectives	3
Goals	3
Objectives	3
Overview of Commission Activities/Process	3
Summary of Recommendations	4
Bibliography	18
Additional Resource Documents	19
Appendix A - Summary of Commission Process.....	A-1
Appendix B - Jail Population Management Intervention Types	B-1
Appendix C - Member Voting Record	C-1
Appendix D - Recommendations Chart (<i>Implementing Agency & Estimated Cost</i>).....	D-1

LOUISVILLE METRO CORRECTIONS: VISION 20/20

Membership

Justice Martin E. Johnstone, Co-Chair
Kentucky Supreme Court (Retired)

Judge Edmund P. Karem, Co-Chair
Kentucky Court of Appeals (Retired)

Judge James M. Shake
Chief Judge, Jefferson Circuit Court

John D. Rees
Commissioner, KY Department of Corrections

Judge Judith K. Bartholomew
Chief Judge, Jefferson District Court

David Lambertus
Attorney at Law

Judge Eleanore Garber
Jefferson Family Court

Doug Cobb
CEO, Appriss, Inc.

David L. Nicholson
Jefferson County Circuit Court Clerk

Gabriela Alcalde
Community Volunteer

Dave Stengel
Jefferson Commonwealth's Attorney

Raoul Cunningham
President, Louisville Branch NAACP

Glenda Bradshaw
Assistant Jefferson County Attorney

Dr. Bruce Williams
Senior Pastor, Bates Memorial Baptist Church

Jason Nemes
Director
Administrative Office of the Courts

Ed Manassah
Executive Director, Institute for Media,
Culture and Ethics, Bellarmine University

Daniel T. Goyette
Chief Public Defender
Louisville-Jefferson County
Public Defender Corporation

David Musacchio
Criminal Justice Facility Planning Consultant

RESOURCE TEAM

Kim M. Allen
Director, Public Protection Department

Lieutenant Colonel Vince Robison
Administrative Bureau Chief,
Louisville Metro Police Department

Patricia Combs
Branch Manager, Probation and Parole

Tom Campbell
Director, Metro Department of Corrections

Tim Vize
Jefferson Court Administrator

Betsy Helm
Public Protection Technology Administrator

Bruce McMichael
Public Protection Coordinator

I. MAYOR'S CHARGE TO THE COMMISSION

At the organizational meeting of the commission on November 29, 2007, Mayor Jerry Abramson presented his charge to the group along with an overview of the significant issues facing the Louisville Metro Department of Corrections. Although the Mayor indicated that Metro Corrections has taken a number of positive steps to respond to the challenges associated with a rising inmate population, he outlined his goal to develop a comprehensive plan that addresses both existing and future needs and provides strategic direction as the community looks forward to the year 2020. The commission was asked to review existing operations and provide guidance and recommendations to ensure that limited correctional resources are being used in an efficient and effective manner.

II. COMMISSION GOALS/OBJECTIVES

A. Goals

- 1) Develop recommendations for inclusion in a long-term plan for the future operation of Metro Corrections;
- 2) Ensure that Metro Corrections has sufficient secure space to incarcerate offenders who pose a risk to the community;
- 3) Reduce the number of offenders who return to jail by providing assistance and referrals when individuals transition back into the community; and
- 4) Hold offenders accountable for compliance in all correctional programs and services.

B. Objectives

- 1) To evaluate current and future program and facility needs;
- 2) To identify ways to enhance existing jail programs and make them more effective;
- 3) To review and analyze how cases currently flow through the system and identify opportunities to speed up or streamline the process; and
- 4) To maximize the use of technology in the operation of Metro Corrections.

III. OVERVIEW OF COMMISSION ACTIVITIES/PROCESS

After receiving a call to action from the Mayor, the Commission met on a total of 10 occasions between November 2007 and May 2008. Although the Commission set an ambitious goal of completing its work in 90 days, subsequent extensions of the timeline were requested and approved by Mayor Abramson to provide ample time for a thorough and systemic review and discussion of the multifaceted issues involved in jail population management.

Initial meetings were focused on informing commission members about the operations of the Louisville Metro Department of Corrections and the challenges of managing a jail population that has routinely exceeded the physical capacity of the facilities. In addition to receiving background information on Metro Corrections and other resource documents, the Commission tracked pending legislation impacting corrections and jails during the 2008 session of the Kentucky General Assembly. Members also received presentations on existing programs that serve as alternatives to incarceration; background information from a statewide perspective relating to jail crowding; and information from other cities and counties across the country that have achieved success and been progressive in jail population management (see Appendix A). A complete bibliography of information provided to the Commission members is included at the end of the report.

Using a chart compiled by staff which listed possible points of intervention to address jail crowding as a guide (see Appendix B), members reviewed and discussed options that are currently in place in Louisville Metro along with options being utilized in other areas. As an outcome of the review and discussion, staff prepared an initial draft of recommendations. These recommendations were discussed, edited and formally voted upon by the membership at the last scheduled meeting on May 22, 2007.

IV. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The following 37 recommendations were approved by a simple majority of the Commission membership during a roll call vote (see Appendix C). Members who were unable to attend the meeting were allowed to submit votes by e-mail and members with dissenting opinions were given the opportunity to submit minority reports.

It is the belief of the Metro Corrections: Vision 20/20 Commission membership that implementation of the approved recommendations will allow the department to utilize limited correctional resources more efficiently, initiate the planning process for new construction, and build a strong foundation for the future. The membership also believes that oversight of the implementation process by an ongoing group of criminal justice agency heads and community leaders is critical to achieving long-term success in jail population management.

Although the Metro Criminal Justice Commission has convened prior committees to address jail crowding dating back to the mid-1980's, none of the previous groups incorporated the participation of community leaders. The participation of community leaders brought a new perspective and challenged criminal justice system agencies to review and rethink current practices with the goal of streamlining operations and enhancing systemic approaches.

Recommendation #1

LMDC should continue discussions with the Kentucky Department of Corrections (KDOC) regarding the statutory 45-day time period for removal of state inmates (KRS 532.100) and the requirement to hold probation/parole violators. Parole violators frequently remain incarcerated beyond the 45-day-period awaiting a hearing or return of a warrant by the Parole Board.

Rationale/Impact:

According to KRS 532.100, “state prisoners, excluding the Class D felons and Class C felons qualifying to serve time in county jails, shall be transferred to the state institution within forty-five (45) days of final sentencing.” At the present, LMDC is holding an average of 100 state inmates and approximately 25-30 parole violators on a daily basis. Although KDOC has been helpful in addressing this situation, the expedited removal of state inmates and probation/parole violators would free additional jail beds.

Recommendation #2

Technical assistance should be requested through the National Center for State Courts to review and update the Jefferson felony case processing study that was conducted in 1995. Following the last study, target times were incorporated into local court rules.

Rationale/Impact:

Following the 1995 felony case study, specific case processing timelines were established and incorporated into local court rules. Although timelines were adopted, there has been no tracking to determine overall compliance in the absence of a process for data collection and a computerized monitoring system. The findings and timelines from the 1995 study should provide a starting point for updating information and developing a new plan. Since the jail population is determined by the number of individuals incarcerated and how long they stay, any effort to expedite case processing can have a significant impact on the jail population. Technical assistance is available through the National Center for State Courts; the next application cycle begins in October 2008.

Recommendation #3

Request an external management audit of the current system business process by a non-criminal justice agency to identify opportunities to streamline or improve processes through technology.

Rationale/Impact:

As Commission members discussed existing challenges in case processing along with technological limitations, it became readily apparent that the criminal justice system is not functioning as a true system, but is plagued by duplicative and outdated processes and procedures. Members specified a “non-criminal justice agency” to promote an objective review of existing operations and the identification of attainable improvements in the

underlying business process. The goal of the study would be improving the overall operation of the system and ultimately, expediting case processing.

Recommendation #4

Establish an e-mail link, and ultimately a computer interface, between LMDC and the Circuit Clerk's Office to facilitate communication and provide a record of transactions related to court orders and releases.

Rationale/Impact:

At the present, communication between personnel of the Jefferson Circuit Clerk's Office and Metro Corrections occurs by telephone, facsimile, or personal delivery of documents by the Sheriff's Office. Although interagency communication has traditionally occurred by phone, the process does not provide a mechanism for documenting the transaction nor promoting accountability. It is anticipated that improved communication and record keeping will help to prevent errors in the process of releasing inmates.

Recommendation #5

LMDC should continue cooperative efforts with the Office of Probation/Parole to expedite the Presentence Investigative Report (PSI).

Rationale/Impact:

LMDC currently holds approximately 40 inmates on a daily basis awaiting completion of the PSI. With knowledge that the process of completing the PSI averages 30 days, expediting the process will speed the transfer of state inmates to the prison system and free additional jail beds.

Recommendation #6

Encourage the Mayor to initiate a dialogue with the Administrative Office of the Courts regarding reinstituting the method of issuing summonses prior to 1999 as it relates to notification.

Rationale/Impact:

Prior to October 1, 1999, when a summonses or arrest warrant was issued, it was docketed prior to service and given a docket/case number with a court date. The Circuit Court Clerk's Office mailed a summons letter to the defendant with the court information and a copy was provided to the police for service. After October 1, 1999, summons and arrest warrants were no longer docketed prior to service, however a postcard notification system was established for summons only that was funded by the former Louisville Division of Police. The postcard was similar to the previous summons letter, but did not include an assigned case number or court date.

Based upon review and discussion by the Warrant Process Committee, reconvened by the Metro Criminal Justice Commission, it was determined that the postcard process stopped at some point following merger and there is currently no notification to a defendant that a summons exists. Without knowledge of the summons or a subsequent response by the

defendant, the initial summons may be ultimately converted to a bench warrant, resulting in an arrest. It is hoped that reinstituting a notification process would result in an improved response from the service of summonses.

Recommendation #7

Consider implementation of a “Citation Docket” for selected misdemeanor offenses similar to Nashville (Davidson County), Tennessee.

Rationale/Impact:

In an attempt to reduce jail crowding and reduce its failure to appear (FTA) rate, Nashville/Davidson County implemented two programs in 2005. These included the “One-Stop Citation Docket” and the “Three-Day Jail Docket”. The Citation Docket encourages law enforcement to issue citations for designated offenses instead of making arrests. The defendant is identified, photographed, and fingerprinted and the information is sent to the jail database and ultimately transferred to the Court Clerk who docket the case. The defendant and or defense counsel conferences the case with prosecution, which in most cases results in a plea agreement that is entered before the judge. The judge issues a show cause date to complete diversion or pay a fine. The case is tracked for compliance and if successful, no further court appearance is required. If noncompliant, the defendant must reappear and is normally sentenced to jail.

The Three-Day Jail Docket ensures that defendants in custody receive a court date within three days of incarceration. At the initial court appearance, all necessary parties are present with the goal of disposal of the case. Statistics indicate that a large percentage of the cases are settled at the initial appearance. The docket reduces the number of court appearances as well as jail bed days. Nashville has experienced significant success with a reduction in FTAs as a result of the “One-Stop Citation Docket” and a reduced length of stay in the jail due to the “Three-Day Jail Docket”. Commission members believe the Nashville program merits consideration and potential adoption within Jefferson County.

Recommendation #8

Collect and analyze data to determine the local impact of using preset pretrial bonds based upon the Uniform Bond Schedule. The Commission believes that bond-related issues are critical to jail population management and recommends that the research be identified as an initial priority for the Jail Policy Committee.

Rationale/Impact:

Although Commission members agreed that issues relating to bonds are a critical component of jail population management, members expressed conflicting opinions as to whether use of preset bonds would increase or decrease designated bond amounts. Currently, bond-related data is not easily retrievable; however, it is apparent that a large number of pretrial inmates are being held in jail because of their inability to pay even small bond amounts.

With knowledge that statewide efforts to address bond-related issues had been undertaken by a work group under the leadership of Supreme Court Justice Will T. Scott, the

Commission monitored these efforts. The recommendations of the work group resulted in passage of SB 92 and a series of proposed changes in the rules of criminal procedure. KRS 431.540 (via SB 92 enacted during the 2008 Session) was amended so that the Supreme Court may by rule or order prescribe a uniform schedule of amounts of bail in designated ***nonviolent Class D felonies***, misdemeanors and violations.

If the proposed amendments to the rules of criminal procedure are approved at the June Kentucky Bar conference, the changes would: allow LMDC to prepare bonds and receive bail; establish a revamped Appendix A – Uniform Schedule of Bail that lists all offenses and has reduced bail amounts than what are currently levied; provide individuals incarcerated for nonpayment of fines with increased credit for incarceration of up to \$50 per day; and require release of a person arrested for Alcohol Intoxication or Drinking Alcoholic Beverages in a Public Place without two prior convictions in 12 months within eight hours; and eliminate requirement to pay a bail (\$25 prepayable fine). The actual and proposed changes, if enacted, should result in fewer secure beds being utilized for individuals that are unable to post bail.

Recommendation #9

Implement a special docket staffed by a Senior Status Judge to handle cases involving violations of the conditions of probation.

Rationale/Impact:

Although the Senior Status Judge program, funded through the Administrative Office of the Courts, will conclude at the end of the current calendar year, judges will continue to serve for an additional five to six years. The Senior Status Judge must work 600 days during the course of the five-year senior status period (120 days per year). A weekly probation revocation docket could be instrumental in reducing case processing delays, especially in Circuit Court. The expedited removal of state inmates and probation/parole violators would free additional jail beds. LMDC houses an estimated 85 probation violators per day for an average of 45 days.

Recommendation #10

Encourage the judiciary to consider delegating authority to Metro Corrections to move/place individuals in non-jail options by standing order or use of preset criteria or guidelines.

Rationale/Impact:

Unlike the state system in which an individual is sentenced to the Kentucky Department of Corrections for classification and placement, by statute, local judges sentence directly to non-jail options. As such, LMDC has no authority to transfer an inmate from one sanction to another without a court hearing. During discussion, the Commission identified one local exception involving the Turning It Around (TIA) program, which targets individuals charged with offenses related to nonpayment of child support. Based upon a standing judicial order, the TIA Office is given the authority to refer a defendant to the Home Incarceration Program (HIP). Allowing LMDC to transfer defendants to

less restrictive alternatives based upon preset criterion would expedite case processing and promote more efficient utilization of non-jail options through centralized assessment and placement.

Recommendation #11

Utilize a Senior Status Judge to work with LMDC in reviewing cases for possible release or transfer to non-jail options.

Rationale/Impact:

In conjunction with Recommendation #10, a Senior Status Judge could be assigned to review targeted cases and confer with the sentencing judge regarding the possibility of transfer to less restrictive options. This measure would promote expedited movement of eligible offenders to non-jail options which would in turn free secure bed space.

Recommendation #12

Establish an electronic interface between the courts and the KDOC computer system and encourage the judiciary to develop an automated process for immediate entry of the Order of Judgment and Commitment.

Rationale/Impact:

Currently, there is no automated process for entry of the Order of Judgment and Commitment. As a result, paper copies requiring signatures are prepared, collected, and sent to the Kentucky Department of Corrections for processing. Immediate entry of the order would eliminate delays and would reduce the number of felony bed days (at present, an average of eight days elapse between final sentencing and receipt of order). Additionally, automating the process would enable better tracking of state inmates.

Recommendation #13

Utilize a Senior Status Judge to work with members of the judiciary, prosecution and defense to review and evaluate the existing range of non-jail options and create a continuum of sanctions from most to least restrictive. This review should include the following: assessment process; program eligibility criteria; fee issues involving indigent clients; programs targeting female offenders; education and involvement of family members; and utilization of offender-based tracking systems to identify ways to promote effective utilization of limited resources.

Rationale/Impact:

Although Jefferson County has been progressive in establishing an array of non-jail options, these programs have operated as independent entities and have never been formally incorporated into a continuum of sanctions from most to least restrictive. Similarly, program eligibility and referral has been driven by practice and preference as opposed to centralized assessment and agreed upon criteria. Conducting a comprehensive review and development of a plan would improve the ability to evaluate the effectiveness of programs; enhance the range of programs; and identify inmate

incentives for program compliance and completion. Full utilization of non-jail options would greatly enhance local jail population management efforts.

Recommendation #14

Create a separate sobering-up station for alcohol intoxicants that do not meet the criteria for The Healing Place, but could be managed at an alternate site.

Rationale/Impact:

The Healing Place's Community Assistance Program (CAP) currently operates a van to pick up intoxicated individuals on the street and transport them to its detox center. Although LMPD reports that officers utilize this service and drop off individuals when possible (see Recommendation #28), LMDC continues to receive intoxicated individuals who do not fall within the shelter guidelines and who do not pose a safety threat to the community. The jail becomes a "sobering up station" for these individuals, but is not properly equipped to handle them. Intoxicated individuals pose particular challenges for LMDC since they tend to be booked at the busiest times leaving limited opportunities for individualized attention and monitoring. In some cases, managing these individuals in a jail environment only serves to escalate negative behavior resulting in added charges. There were 135 AI arrests during the month of January 2008 (includes AI plus additional charges).

Recommendation #15

Establish the position of Jail Population Manager within LMDC to review individual bonds and cases for consideration for release or transfer to less restrictive options.

Rationale/Impact:

This recommendation was included in the report of the criminal justice consultant who conducted a comprehensive jail population analysis that was presented to the Commission in December 2007 (*Voorhis, 2007*). Establishing an internal LMDC position, similar to a position currently in place in the Kenton County Jail, would allow the individual to closely monitor both pretrial and sentenced populations while working with the Senior Status Judge to identify eligible candidates for release or transfer to non-jail options such as HIP.

Recommendation #16

Expand the utilization of the Home Incarceration Program (electronic monitoring); enhance the level of direct supervision by officers in the community; use GPS monitoring for high risk offenders; and encourage use of HIP in lieu of weekend or other customized jail sentences.

Rationale/Impact:

As an option to incarceration, electronic monitoring is an extremely cost-effective form of supervision that provides greater offender accountability than options such as work release or "weekend" jail sentences. Although the capacity is unlimited, the Home Incarceration Program currently averages 466 participants per day. The monitoring equipment costs \$1.06 per unit versus \$58 per day for jail. The cost of GPS monitoring ranges from \$4.85-\$8.48 per day per unit and provides an even more restrictive option for

higher risk offenders. Greater utilization of this non-jail option for targeted individuals can free secure jail beds while allowing offenders to be safely managed in the community.

Recommendation #17

LMDC should work with the Office of Probation/Parole and members of the judiciary to identify ways to promote full utilization of the Misdemeanant Intensive Probation Program.

Rationale/Impact:

LMDC contracts with the Kentucky Department of Corrections to operate the Misdemeanant Intensive Probation (MIP) program at a cost of \$286,000 per year for a capacity of 270 participants. Historically, when the program nears or reaches its capacity, the MIP program notifies the court to stop referrals. Unfortunately, when slots are once again open, it has been difficult to “restart” the process. Judges seem reluctant to refer defendants due to the uncertainty as to its capacity. As a result, the program frequently is underutilized. Since the MIP program is viewed by the courts and the criminal justice system as an effective alternative program, efforts should be made to maximize its utilization.

Recommendation #18

Work toward implementation of a Day Reporting Center (DRC) as a new alternative program that would incorporate the function of the Court Monitoring Center, provide drug testing, and link individuals with needed educational and treatment services as a way to facilitate community reentry.

Rationale/Impact:

A Day Reporting Center (DRC) provides a designated location for selected offenders to report while on pretrial status, probation or parole and gain access to a broad range of services. DRCs include educational services, vocational training, treatment, and other relevant programs. These centers are in operation in numerous jurisdictions across the country and provide an effective alternative to incarceration. Typically, DRCs provide an option for both pretrial and sentenced inmates who can be managed safely in the community at an estimated cost of \$11-\$28 per day versus \$58 per day for secure detention.

Recommendation #19

Establish a process to provide regular informational updates to the judiciary, prosecution and defense bar on the status of the jail population and the utilization of non-jail options.

Rationale/Impact:

Over the years, various reporting mechanisms have been utilized to provide information to criminal justice system agencies and the courts on the status of the jail population. During the Metro Corrections: Vision 20/20 process, LMDC began sending updates to the Chief Judges on the population count and the number of participants on home incarceration. Experience across the country has shown that successful jail population management is rooted in open communication and ongoing efforts to inform and educate system players.

Recommendation #20

Encourage continued funding for existing diversionary programs for the mentally ill including the Community Treatment Alternatives Program (CTAP), the Mental Health Diversion Program, the Mental Health Enhanced Supervision Docket, and the Mental Health Prerelease Pilot Project.

Rationale/Impact:

LMDC contracts with Seven Counties Services to provide these programs at a cost of \$183,000 per year. Through these programs, individuals with serious mental illness are identified and assessed at various stages in the criminal justice system and where appropriate, diverted to community-based case management and treatment. During FY06, a total of 179 individuals were diverted into the programs saving 28,305 jail bed days or \$1,641,690. Funding has been included in the Mayor's FY'09 budget.

Recommendation #21

Encourage continued funding and Supreme Court approval of diversionary programs within the JCAO including DUI, Domestic Violence and general diversion programs.

Rationale/Impact:

The Jefferson County Attorney's Office (JCAO) currently operates a range of deferred prosecution programs that provide first-time offenders with the opportunity to remain in the community under supervision while completing volunteer work, education, and treatment programs. Individuals who enroll and successfully complete diversion programs are not utilizing scarce jail beds and are provided with incentive to remain productive members of the community. The JCAO's 2007 data indicates that 532 of 656 cases (81%) completed general diversion and worked 18,392 volunteer hours.

Recommendation #22

Encourage continued and expanded utilization of the Pretrial Conditional Release Program.

Rationale/Impact:

The Pretrial Conditional Release Monitoring Program targets defendants who remain in jail because they are unable to make bond following their first appearance in court. The

majority of the participants have been charged with Class C and D felonies and are judicially referred. The program is state-funded and operated by Pretrial Services, a division of the Administrative Office of the Courts. As components of the program, Pretrial Services provides the following services: random drug testing (if charged with drug possession/use offense); electronic monitoring and home incarceration; reporting and court notification; office visits (frequency determined by judge); compliance verification for employment, treatment, child support, no contact by victim; and 24-hour curfew monitoring. There is currently an average of 43 participants in the Jefferson County program on a daily basis. Although approximately 75% of the individuals arrested are eligible for non-financial release, only 60% are released on their own recognizance (ROR). Utilization of this pretrial program frees secure jail beds and reduces the failure to appear rate while allowing eligible participants to be drug tested and monitored in the community.

Recommendation #23

Encourage continued utilization and funding for Jefferson County Drug Court Programs.

Rationale/Impact:

Drug Courts provide an effective and cost-efficient alternative to incarceration through the innovative use of comprehensive supervision, drug testing, judicial monitoring, and sanctions and incentives. Research on Kentucky Drug Courts indicates that two years after completing the program, drug court graduates had a recidivism rate of 20% versus a rate of 57.3% for those on probation convicted of similar offenses two years after the probationary period. The Jefferson County Program had a total of 191 through May 2008 and reports an approximate 87% success rate. The program costs \$1,850 per year or \$5 per day.

Recommendation #24

Provide immediate jail bed capacity through privatization of the Work Release Program.

Rationale/Impact:

Although Commission members briefly discussed the options of eliminating or reducing the Work Release Program (WRP) as has occurred in other jurisdictions across the country, members ultimately opted for privatization. The concern was raised that some individuals do not have suitable home placements to permit participation in the Home Incarceration Program (HIP). Currently, LMDC provides bed space for 275 work release inmates at a cost of \$58 per day. Privatization of Work Release would free secure jail beds and is estimated to cost \$30 per day or \$3 million per year.

Recommendation #25

Add additional jail beds where possible within the square footage requirements mandated by the Kentucky Jail Standards.

Rationale/Impact:

Kentucky jail standards currently require 40 square feet of space per inmate. Renovation of the dormitories within the existing facility could provide an additional 228 beds at an estimated cost of \$125,000. The renovation would require purchasing additional bunk beds and relocating metal tables that may or not be reusable after the move. Additional costs include the purchase of mattresses and sheets for the new bunks.

Recommendation #26

Establish a work group to identify long-term bed space needs and initiate the planning process for future construction.

Rationale/Impact:

Successful implementation of the recommendations within this report could be extremely helpful in reducing jail crowding. However, the Voorhis Report and population trends indicate that additional jail space will be needed in the near future. To initiate the planning process, the Commission recommends that a Jail Construction Planning Group be established, possibly as a work group of the Jail Policy Committee, to study and explore options. Jail construction costs are currently estimated at \$70,000-100,000 per bed depending on the level of security and infrastructure requirements.

Recommendation #27

Encourage LMPD and small city police departments to use citations in lieu of arrest whenever possible through training and regular policy reminders.

Rationale/Impact:

Increasing the use of citations by law enforcement officers for individuals who do not pose a safety risk to the community is a common focus of jurisdictions that are attempting to more effectively manage their jail population. With knowledge that LMPD has a specific policy on use of citations, Metro Corrections provided LMPD with a recent sample of arrest data to permit a review of the use of citations by its officers. Although the data remains under review at this time, experience across the country has identified the need for clear law enforcement policy on use of citations along with reinforcement of the policy through periodic training and reminders.

Recommendation #28

Encourage LMPD to utilize The Healing Place or other established facilities as a sobering-up station for individuals on the street who are under the influence of alcohol through training and regular policy reminders.

Rationale/Impact:

LMPD reports that officers continue to use the Healing Place as a local drop-off option for individuals picked up on the street that are under the influence of alcohol. On June 19, 2008, LMPD published and circulated General Memorandum #08-016 to remind all officers about the Healing Place Community Assistance Program (CAP) van service and

provide an outline of operational guidelines for use of the service. The Commission believes that use of these facilities, when appropriate, provides a positive and less costly alternative to arrest that affords the individual the opportunity to sober up in a safe environment and be linked to needed community services (See Recommendation #14)

Recommendation #29

Encourage LMPD to continue its commitment to specialized training and deployment of Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) members in responding to incidents involving the seriously mentally ill.

Rationale/Impact:

The Louisville Metro Police Department's Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) began as a pilot project with a limited number of officers receiving training; now, all officers are trained to respond to incidents involving individuals with serious and persistent mental illness in the community. During 2007, CIT Team members intervened in cases involving 3,005 individuals who were transported to the hospital in lieu of arrest. As a result of the CIT response, these individuals were diverted from jail and transported to the hospital for needed treatment.

Recommendation #30

Build upon data available through eWarrant System to develop an electronic database that includes information on court dates and outstanding summonses/warrants that can be queried by the public and criminal justice system agencies via the internet.

Rationale/Impact:

Currently, only authorized criminal justice agency representatives have access to electronic data regarding warrants and summonses. A citizen must contact the courts by telephone or in person to determine if a warrant or summons has been issued. There are over 56,000 outstanding bench/arrest warrants and over 16,000 outstanding summonses. From January to May 2008, there were 3,077 summonses issued and 1,687 served. Public access to information via the internet would likely increase the number of voluntary surrenders, decrease the rate of individuals who fail to appear for their court date (FTA), and reduce the number of warrants issued for failure to appear.

Recommendation #31

Establish a system to automatically notify/remind defendants of upcoming court dates.

Rationale/Impact:

A number of jurisdictions have procedures in place to notify defendants of upcoming court dates. These procedures range from phone calls or postcards to use of automated systems. Although implementation of this initiative would fall within the purview of the Administrative Office of the Courts, it is anticipated that the cost of notification could be considerably less than the costs associated with the failure to appear rate, such as re-docketing cases and issuing new subpoenas for witnesses. It is also anticipated that as a

consequence of reducing the failure to appear rate, fewer bench warrants would be issued and fewer individuals would be arrested on bench warrants.

Recommendation #32

Create a customer-friendly mechanism for electronic payment of bonds, fines, fees and placement of funds into LMDC inmate accounts.

Rationale/Impact:

Metro Corrections is currently pursuing an option utilized in Fayette County in which individuals or family members can pay bond amounts via the internet using a credit card. After the payment is posted to the inmate's account, Metro Corrections would transfer the money to the Circuit Clerk's Office. Fayette County is also using a kiosk system to facilitate making external payment into inmate accounts. This new capability would expedite the release process for eligible inmates.

Recommendation #33

Reconvene the Jail Policy Committee of the Metro Criminal Justice Commission to oversee implementation of the Metro Corrections: Vision 20/20 recommendations.

Rationale/Impact:

Beginning in the mid-1980's, the Criminal Justice Commission has played a central role in coordinating local system efforts to address jail crowding. With knowledge that the jail population reflects the end result of policy decisions made across the entire criminal justice system, it is critical to have an ongoing group in place to review and discuss systemic solutions and make recommendations to enhance jail population management. It therefore recommended that the Jail Policy Committee be reconvened to assume this important role.

Recommendation #34

Expand the membership of the Jail Policy Committee to include the participation of community leaders.

Rationale/Impact:

Although a number of committees have been convened over the years to address jail crowding, the membership was limited to criminal justice agency representatives. For the first time, the Metro Corrections: Vision 20/20 Commission incorporated the participation of community leaders. Based on the fresh perspective and valuable input that community leaders brought to the process, it is recommended that the Jail Policy Committee follow this model and invite community leaders to participate as members of the committee.

Recommendation #35

Require the Jail Policy Committee to report to the Mayor on a quarterly basis.

Rationale/Impact:

Since the Jail Policy Committee will be charged with implementing the recommendations contained within this report, it is imperative that the leadership of the committee report to the Mayor on a regular basis and remain accountable to the public for its efforts. While some of the recommendations can be acted upon immediately, a number will require considerable planning and coordination prior to implementation.

Recommendation #36

Request the Jail Policy Committee to explore the possibility of outsourcing the HIP Program.

Rationale/Impact:

During member discussion of the Home Incarceration Program, the option of privatization was raised as a possible option for reducing the costs of operation while allowing correctional officers currently dedicated to the program to be reassigned to other duties. Although the Commission did not have ample time to undertake this study, it is recommended that this task be assigned to the Jail Policy Committee.

Recommendation #37

Request the Jail Policy Committee to study the demographic make-up of the jail population (including age, race, gender, income level, education, zip code, previous criminal record, immigration status, and number of children under age 18) to identify patterns and trends in the jail population, possible points of intervention/prevention, and evaluate effectiveness of current projects/policies. The Committee should seek to implement an offender-based tracking system to facilitate this effort.

Rationale/Impact:

Along with its recommendations to address current issues related to jail crowding, the Commission believes that it is important to better understand the variables and factors that drive the make-up of the jail population. It is hoped that this information could be helpful in developing prevention programs or targeting future initiatives to stem the tide of individuals incarcerated in the community. Numerous jurisdictions have implemented offender-based tracking systems to enhance data collection and permit analysis to inform decision-making.

Additional Suggestions for Consideration by Jail Policy Committee:

- Assess current procedures and policies within the LMDC in regards to language access to ensure that these meet Title VI standards. If no current policies and procedures exist, develop such from best practices models and provide training for jail employees.

Potential Outcomes: Equal service and treatment of jail inmates; shortened stay of Limited English Proficiency (LEP) persons in jail system due to ineffective and inaccurate communication; prevention of potential problems due to lack of understanding between jail employees and jail inmate.

- Assess rising female jail population to better understand reasons for increase. Explore whether current jail system services and policies meet the needs of female jail population (i.e. reproductive health services, pregnancy and childbirth, breastfeeding, domestic violence victimization, young children, and mental health support services).

Potential Outcomes: More effective management of female-specific needs/problems in jail system; reduced recidivism by addressing needs of entire family unit; improved community health through coordinated prenatal and postpartum care and breastfeeding.

V. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, Kim. "Jefferson County's Response to Jail Crowding." *National Association of Criminal Justice Planners News Update*, January 30, 1989.

Beck, Allen R. "Jail Bloating: A Common But Unnecessary Cause of Jail Overcrowding," 2001.

Cheves, John. "Cramming in the inmates...with prisons full, many county jails are overflowing with felons." *Lexington Herald-Leader*, January 13, 2008.

Cheves, John. "Justice system cuts to fund Corrections." *Lexington Herald-Leader*, January 30, 2008.

Cheves, John. "What jailers want is more state money." *Lexington Herald-Leader*, January 14, 2008.

Dantis, John P. "Judges on the Payroll: A Radical Approach to Population Management." *Local Jail Network Bulletin*, 2001.

Ford, Marilyn Chandler. "Controlling Inmate Population Size: A Case Study of 20 Years of Success." *LJN Exchange*, 2007.

"Mahoning County: Population Reduction Orders on a Human Scale." *Correctional law Reporter*, December/January 2008.

One in 100: Behind Bars in America 2008. Pew Charitable Trust, March 2008.

Parrish, Col. David M. "Population Management: Dealing with Crowded Conditions in the Hillsborough County (Florida) System." *The Journal of County Administration*, October 2007.

Petteruti, Amanda and Nastassia Walsh. *Jailing Communities: The Impact of Jail Expansion and Effective Public Safety Strategies*. Justice Policy Institute, April 2008.

Voorhis, David J., Detention System Data Assessment and Staffing Study. November 2007. Voorhis/Robertson Justice Services, Inc.

Additional Resource Documents

- History of Local Efforts in Jail Population Management
- LMCO 30.20
- KRS 67B.010, 532.210, 431.015, 431.410, 455.160, 514.040
- Letter to Judge David Armstrong from Judge Ellen B. Ewing, November 6, 1990
- Initiatives that Reduced the Jail Population, Hillsborough County Sheriff's Office, Department of Detention Services
- Louisville Metro Department of Corrections Fact Sheet
- Program Descriptions: Court Monitoring Center, Work Release, Home Incarceration, Misdemeanant Intensive Probation Program, Pathways Reentry Program, Jefferson County Conditional Release Monitoring Program, Mental Health Diversion Program, Community Treatment Alternatives Program, Mental Health Court/Enhanced Supervision Docket, Community Assistance Program/The Healing Place, Jefferson County Attorney's DUI First Offender Diversion Program
- Chart: Metro Corrections Annual Budget and Average Daily Detention Population (1981-2007)
- Chart: Jail Population Management - Possible Points of Intervention
- Chart: Jail Population Management Intervention Types
- Chart: Home Incarceration Program Success Rate (FY06-07)
- Chart: LMDC Population Snapshot, February 13, 2008
- LMPD Standard Operating Procedures, SOP. 10.1
- Bond Types
- Uniform Schedule of Bail (Revised February 2004)
- Chart: Jefferson County Pretrial Services, Defendants Currently Incarcerated with a Bond Set (March 10, 2008 Snapshot)
- Proposal for Alternatives to Jailing and Incarceration, Professor Johnny B. Hill, Louisville Seminary
- Chart: Local Criminal Justice System - Responsibility by Level of Government
- Criminal Justice System Overview
- Chart: Metro Corrections Statistics (Calendar Year 2007)
- Current Operating Jail Population Intervention Types
- Jefferson County Attorney's DUI First Offenders Diversion Program (FODP) Entry Process
- SB 92 - An act relating to the uniform scheduling of bail
- 2008 Kentucky General Assembly Legislative Tracking Chart

METRO CORRECTIONS: VISION 20/20
Summary of Commission Process

Meeting Dates (10):

November 29, 2007	February 28, 2008
December 14, 2007	March 13, 2008
January 10, 2008	April 3, 2008
January 24, 2008	April 24, 2008
February 14, 2008	May 22, 2008

Presentations:

November 29:	Louisville Metro Detention Data Analysis Study David J. Voorhis, Criminal Justice Consultant
December 14:	Metro Corrections Overview Tom Campbell, Director
January 10:	Program Overviews - HIP, Work Release, CMC, TIA
January 24:	Statewide Perspective on Jail Operation Robert G. Lawson, Professor of Law University of Kentucky College of Law
	MIP, Jefferson County Conditional Release Monitoring
February 14:	Monica Williams, National Artistic Advisor Kentucky Foundation for Women
March 13:	Bernalillo County Metropolitan Detention Center Population Management John P. Dantis, Deputy County Manager Bernalillo County, New Mexico

Tours:

December 14	Tour of Jail Complex
April 7	Tour of CCC

JAIL POPULATION MANAGEMENT Intervention Types			
	<i>Technology</i>	<i>Case Processing</i>	<i>Jail Space</i>
<i>System Efficiency Measures</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Electronic access to data <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Public B. System (judges, law enforcement, attorneys) Public Notification <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Summons B. Warrants C. Court dates/FTA Electronic payment options 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Judicial review of cases/bonds for less restrictive placement Bond criteria/guidelines Use of summonses vs. warrants Citation Docket Probation Violation Docket Expedited PSI (Pre-sentence Investigation Report) Immediate entry of sentencing order (Order of Commitment) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase bed space through decrease square footage requirement
<i>Alternative Options</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expansion of HIP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Triage approach to program placement Centralized placement authority (delegation to LMDC) Increase use of citations by police Increase use of drop-off sites for public intoxicants Pretrial release authority Diversion programs Day Reporting Pretrial Conditional Release Information exchange/ full utilization of non jail options Ongoing review body 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Privatize Work Release Eliminate Work Release and replace with HIP Expansion of MIP
<i>Bed Capacity</i>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New jail construction

Appendix C

METRO CORRECTIONS: VISION 20/20 Recommendations - Voting Record																			
	1 = YES 0 = NO					No Vote		Ab - Abstain					18 Voting Members						
	Johnstone	Karem	Alcalde	Bartholomew	Bradshaw	Cobb	Cunningham	Garber	Goyette	Lambertus	Manassah	Musacchio	Nemes	Nicholson	Rees	Shake	Stengel	Williams	Total
Rec#1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		16
Rec#2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		16
Rec#3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		16
Rec#4	1	1	1	1	1	Ab	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		15
Rec#5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		16
Rec#6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		16
Rec#7	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	Ab	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		14
Rec#8	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		16
Rec#9	1	1	Ab	Ab	0	1	Ab	1	1	0	1	1		1	1	1	0		10
Rec#10	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1		1	1	1	0		13
Rec#11	1	1	Ab	0	0	0	Ab	1	1	0	1	1		1	1	1	0		9
Rec#12	1	1	1	1	1	Ab	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		15
Rec#13	1	1	1	1	0	1	Ab	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		14
Rec#14	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		16
Rec#15	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1		1	1	1	Ab		12
Rec#16	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		16
Rec#17	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		16
Rec#18	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		16
Rec#19	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		16
Rec#20	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		16
Rec#21	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		16
Rec#22	1	1	Ab	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	Ab		14
Rec#23	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		16
Rec#24	1	1	1	1	Ab	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	Ab		14
Rec#25	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1		1	1	1	1		12
Rec#26	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		15
Rec#27	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		16
Rec#28	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		16
Rec#29	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		16
Rec#30	1	1	1	1	1	Ab	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		15
Rec#31	1	1	1	1	1	Ab	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		15
Rec#32	1	1	1	1	1	Ab	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		15
Rec#33	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		16
Rec#34	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		16
Rec#35	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		16
Rec#36	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		Ab	1		Ab		13
Rec#37	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1		1		15
Total	37	37	32	34	30	31	34	36	35	32	37	37	0	36	37	35	30	0	

Note - Leo Smith voted as Dan Goyette's designee and Steve Tedder voted as Dave Stengel's designee.

Recommendations Chart (*Implementing Agency & Estimated Cost*)

Recommendations	Implementing Agency	Estimated Cost
<u>Recommendation#1</u> LMDC should continue discussions with the Kentucky Department of Corrections (KDOC) regarding the statutory 45-day time period for removal of state inmates (KRS 532.100) and the requirement to hold probation/parole violators. Parole violators frequently remain incarcerated beyond the 45-day-period awaiting a hearing or return of a warrant by the Parole Board.	LMDC	No Cost
<u>Recommendation#2</u> Technical assistance should be requested through the National Center for State Courts to review and update the Jefferson felony case processing study that was conducted in 1995. Following the last study, target times were incorporated into local court rules.	Criminal Justice Commission (Through AOC)	\$3,000 to \$20,000 cash match depending on contract amount
<u>Recommendation#3</u> Request an external management audit of the current system business process by a non-criminal justice agency to identify opportunities to streamline or improve processes through technology.	Jail Policy Committee	Variable costs depending on scope of audit
<u>Recommendation#4</u> Establish an e-mail link, and ultimately a computer interface, between LMDC and the Circuit Clerk's Office to facilitate communication and provide a record of transactions related to court orders and releases.	Public Protection Technology Administrator	No Cost
<u>Recommendation#5</u> LMDC should continue cooperative efforts with the Office of Probation/Parole to expedite the Presentence Investigative Report (PSI).	LMDC	No Cost
<u>Recommendation#6</u> Encourage the Mayor to initiate a dialogue with the Administrative Office of the Courts regarding reinstituting the method of issuing summonses prior to 1999 as it relates to notification.	CJC Warrant Process Committee	Under \$10,000 annually for letter/postcard notification
<u>Recommendation#7</u> Consider implementation of a "Citation Docket" for selected misdemeanor offenses similar to Nashville (Davidson County), Tennessee.	Jefferson Circuit Court Clerk	TBD
<u>Recommendation#8</u> Collect and analyze data to determine the local impact of using preset pretrial bonds based upon the Uniform Bond Schedule. The Commission believes that bond-related issues are critical to jail population management and recommends that the research be identified as an initial priority for the Jail Policy Committee.	Jail Policy Committee	No Cost

Appendix D

Recommendations	Implementing Agency	Estimated Cost
<u>Recommendation#9</u> Implement a special docket staffed by a Senior Status Judge to handle cases involving violations of the conditions of probation.	AOC	No Cost
<u>Recommendation#10</u> Encourage the judiciary to consider delegating authority to Metro Corrections to move/place individuals in non-jail options by standing order or use of preset criteria or guidelines.	AOC	No Cost
<u>Recommendation#11</u> Utilize a Senior Status Judge to work with LMDC in reviewing cases for possible release or transfer to non-jail options.	AOC	No Cost
<u>Recommendation#12</u> Establish an electronic interface between the courts and the KDOC computer system and encourage the judiciary to develop an automated process for immediate entry of the Order of Judgment and Commitment.	Public Protection Technology Administrator	TBD
<u>Recommendation#13</u> Utilize a Senior Status Judge to work with members of the judiciary, prosecution and defense to review and evaluate the existing range of non-jail options and create a continuum of sanctions from most to least restrictive. This review should include the following: assessment process; program eligibility criteria; fee issues involving indigent clients; programs targeting female offenders; education and involvement of family members; and utilization of offender-based tracking systems to identify ways to promote effective utilization of limited resources.	AOC	No Cost
<u>Recommendation#14</u> Create a separate sobering-up station for alcohol intoxicants that do not meet the criteria for The Healing Place, but could be managed at an alternate site.	Jail Policy Committee	TBD
<u>Recommendation#15</u> Establish the position of Jail Population Manager within LMDC to review individual bonds and cases for consideration for release or transfer to less restrictive options.	LMDC	\$55,000 annually for salary and benefits
<u>Recommendation#16</u> Expand the utilization of the Home Incarceration Program (electronic monitoring); enhance the level of direct supervision by officers in the community; use GPS monitoring for high risk offenders; and encourage use of HIP in lieu of weekend or other customized jail sentences.	LMDC	No cost to increase HIP to 600 inmates, an additional 150 inmates would require four officers, clerk, vehicle, etc.

Appendix D

Recommendations	Implementing Agency	Estimated Cost
<u>Recommendation#17</u> LMDC should work with the Office of Probation/Parole and members of the judiciary to identify ways to promote full utilization of the Misdemeanant Intensive Probation Program.	LMDC	No Cost
<u>Recommendation#18</u> Work toward implementation of a Day Reporting Center (DRC) as a new alternative program that would incorporate the function of the Court Monitoring Center, provide drug testing, and link individuals with needed educational and treatment services as a way to facilitate community reentry.	Partnership with LMDC, Criminal Justice Commission, and AOC	\$11 - \$28 per person per day (versus \$58 per inmate per day)
<u>Recommendation#19</u> Establish a process to provide regular informational updates to the judiciary, prosecution and defense bar on the status of the jail population and the utilization of non-jail options.	LMDC	No Cost
<u>Recommendation#20</u> Encourage continued funding for existing diversionary programs for the mentally ill including the Community Treatment Alternatives Program (CTAP), the Mental Health Diversion Program, the Mental Health Enhanced Supervision Docket, and the Mental Health Prerelease Pilot Project.	Mayor and Metro Council	Continuation of LMDC contract (\$183,095)
<u>Recommendation#21</u> Encourage continued funding and Supreme Court approval of diversionary programs within the JCAO including DUI, Domestic Violence and general diversion programs.	Jail Policy Committee and JCAO	JCAO-funded
<u>Recommendation#22</u> Encourage continued and expanded utilization of the Pretrial Conditional Release Program.	Jail Policy Committee	AOC-funded
<u>Recommendation#23</u> Encourage continued utilization and funding for Jefferson County Drug Court Programs.	Jail Policy Committee	AOC-funded
<u>Recommendation#24</u> Provide immediate jail bed capacity through privatization of the Work Release Program.	LMDC	\$30 per inmate per day or \$3 million annually
<u>Recommendation#25</u> Add additional jail beds where possible within the square footage requirements mandated by the Kentucky Jail Standards.	LMDC	Additional 228 beds (\$125,000)
<u>Recommendation#26</u> Establish a work group to identify long-term bed space needs and initiate the planning process for future construction.	Jail Policy Committee	No Cost
<u>Recommendation#27</u> Encourage LMPD and small city police departments to use citations in lieu of arrest whenever possible through training and regular policy reminders.	Jail Policy Committee	No Cost

Appendix D

Recommendations	Implementing Agency	Estimated Cost
<u>Recommendation#28</u> Encourage LMPD to utilize The Healing Place or other established facilities as a sobering-up station for individuals on the street who are under the influence of alcohol through training and regular policy reminders.	Jail Policy Committee	No Cost
<u>Recommendation#29</u> Encourage LMPD to continue its commitment to specialized training and deployment of Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) members in responding to incidents involving the seriously mentally ill.	Jail Policy Committee	LMPD-funded
<u>Recommendation#30</u> Build upon data available through eWarrant System to develop an electronic database that includes information on court dates and outstanding summonses/warrants that can be queried by the public and criminal justice system agencies via the internet.	Public Protection Technology Administrator	Start up \$100,000 Ongoing \$20,000 annually using outside vendor
<u>Recommendation#31</u> Establish a system to automatically notify/remind defendants of upcoming court dates.	Public Protection Technology Administrator	Start up \$100,000 Ongoing \$75,000-\$100,000 annually
<u>Recommendation#32</u> Create a customer-friendly mechanism for electronic payment of bonds, fines, fees and placement of funds into LMDC inmate accounts.	Public Protection Technology Administrator	No Cost
<u>Recommendation#33</u> Reconvene the Jail Policy Committee of the Metro Criminal Justice Commission to oversee implementation of the Metro Corrections: Vision 20/20 recommendations.	Criminal Justice Commission	No Cost
<u>Recommendation#34</u> Expand the membership of the Jail Policy Committee to include the participation of community leaders.	Jail Policy Committee	No Cost
<u>Recommendation#35</u> Require the Jail Policy Committee to report to the Mayor on a quarterly basis.	Jail Policy Committee	No Cost
<u>Recommendation#36</u> Request the Jail Policy Committee to explore the possibility of outsourcing the HIP Program.	Jail Policy Committee	No cost for study (vendor cost TBD)
<u>Recommendation#37</u> Request the Jail Policy Committee to study the demographic make-up of the jail population (including age, race, gender, income level, education, zip code, previous criminal record, immigration status, and number of children under age 18) to identify patterns and trends in the jail population, possible points of intervention/ prevention, and evaluate effectiveness of current projects/policies. The Committee should seek to implement an offender-based tracking system to facilitate this effort.	Jail Policy Committee	No cost for study (offender-based tracking system cost TBD)

Appendix D

Recommendations	Implementing Agency	Estimated Cost
<p><u>Additional Suggestions for Consideration by Jail Policy Committee:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess current procedures and policies within the LMDC in regards to language access to ensure that these meet Title VI standards. If no current policies and procedures exist, develop such from best practices models and provide training for jail employees. <p><u>Potential Outcomes:</u> Equal service and treatment of jail inmates; shortened stay of Limited English Proficiency (LEP) persons in jail system due to ineffective and inaccurate communication; prevention of potential problems due to lack of understanding between jail employees and jail inmate.</p>	LMDC	No Cost
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess rising female jail population to better understand reasons for increase. Explore whether current jail system services and policies meet the needs of female jail population (i.e. reproductive health services, pregnancy and childbirth, breastfeeding, domestic violence victimization, young children, and mental health support services). <p><u>Potential Outcomes:</u> More effective management of female-specific needs/ problems in jail system; reduced recidivism by addressing needs of entire family unit; improved community health through coordinated prenatal and postpartum care and breastfeeding.</p>	LMDC	No Cost